

REMARKS

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 19-20, 31, and 37-38 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-4, 6-38 are pending.

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haggar et al. (2002/0091904).

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Haggar teaches a heap memory allocation module for processing a storage block request from a program. The heap memory allocation module “receives a heap memory request from a Java application program”, and “makes a determination ... whether there is unused memory available in the handle sub-pool to accommodate the heap memory request.” (section 0033). If “there is not sufficient memory available in the handle sub-pool ... to provide a handle for the storage block request, then the heap memory allocation module makes a determination ... whether there is sufficient memory in the heap to grant the storage block request. Specifically, the heap memory allocation module ... determines whether the size of both the handle sub-pool ... and the storage block sub-pool ... may be increased to accommodate the storage block request without exceeding the size of the heap.” (section 0034). “If there is memory available in the heap ... to grant the storage block request ..., then the heap memory allocation module ... grows the size of the handle sub-pool ...” (section 35). Thus, Haggar teaches consuming and releasing heap memory in accordance with the requirements of **a particular application**. (section 0038, emphasis added). Haggard does not, however, teach “specifying a specified amount of memory in the memory pool for allocation for a memory-requesting process; requesting a memory-releasing process to release a requested amount of memory in the memory pool; wherein the memory-requesting process is not necessarily the same process as the memory-releasing process.” As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-4, 6-18 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 19 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 19 is also allowable.

Claim 20 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 1. Therefore, it is believed that claim 20 is also allowable.

With respect to claim 21, The office action referred to sections 0025 and 0037 of Haggar. Haggar merely teaches that the heap is configured with two variable size sub-pools (section 0025), and that the handles are fixed in size therefore when the handle sub-pool is grown, the handle sub-pool's size increases by a fixed amount (section 0037). Haggar, however, does not teach "receiving status information from a plurality of processes" and "managing memory among the plurality of processes using the status information." As such, claim 21 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 22-28 depend from claim 21 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 29 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 21. Therefore, it is believed that claim 29 is also allowable.

Claim 30 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 21. Therefore, it is believed that claim 30 is also allowable.

With respect to claim 31, Haggar teaches a heap configured with two, variable size sub-pools: a handle sub-pool and a storage sub-pool (section 0025). The heap is used by a program for the temporary storage of data and/or information whose existence or size may not be able to be determined until the program executes. (section 0002). Haggar does not teach "determining an appropriate amount of committed memory in a memory pool" and "allocating the required amount of memory from an uncommitted portion of the memory pool to a process." As such, claim 31 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 32-36 depend from claim 31 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.


Claim 37 recites program code for carrying out the method of claim 31. Therefore, it is believed that claim 37 is also allowable.

Claim 38 recites a system for carrying out the method of claim 31. Therefore, it is believed that claim 38 is also allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8/7/06



Diana Y. Fu
Registration No. 52,924
V 408-973-2593
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014